

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed August 30, 2005, has been reviewed and the Examiner's comments have been carefully considered. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

This Amendment amends claim 48 and adds claims 66 and 67. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier. After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 48-53, 60, 61, 63, 66, and 67 are pending in this application. Applicants submit claims 48-53, 60, 61, 63, 66, and 67 for reconsideration.

The Office Action rejects claims 48-53, 60, 61, and 63 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,554,358 (Kain) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,265,310 (Ichinokawa). The Office asserts that Kain discloses a child seat having "all the claimed invention but fails to show the use of a plurality of hooks engaged with a bar; wherein at least one of the hooks opposes the other hooks." The Office asserts that Ichinokawa "teaches the use of a plurality of hooks (15, 16) engaged with a bar (21); wherein at least one of the hooks opposes the other hooks." The Office asserts "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the seat with a plurality of hooks wherein one of the hooks opposes the other as taught by Ichinokawa, in order to the remove the backrest from the base faster and more convenient for the occupant."

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 48, as amended, recites a child seat for seating a child within a vehicle comprising, among other things, (1) a base having a seating surface for receiving a child, (2) a backrest, and (3) a connection mechanism that connects the base and the backrest and that includes a plurality of hooks engaged with a bar, wherein the curved surface of at least one of the hooks opposes the curved surface of at least two of the other hooks.

The Office asserts that the tiltable base 10 of Kain corresponds to the base recited in the claim. In view Applicants' amendment of claim 48, however, the tiltable base 10 of Kain cannot be deemed to correspond to the base of claim 48. For example, the tiltable base 10 of Kain does not have a seating surface for receiving a child, as now recited in claim 48.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit there would have been no motivation to combine Kain and Ichinokawa in the manner suggested by the Office. In particular, the Office asserts that it would have been obvious to combine Kain and Ichinokawa to permit faster and more convenient removal of the backrest from the base. There is no suggestion, however, that using the Ichinokawa hooks in the Kain device would make removal faster or more convenient. More specifically, the Kain device already contains clamps 24, 27 on the seat 22 that engage with a mounting rod 18 on the base 10. The Office states no reason for believing that replacing Kain's clamps 24, 27 with the Ichinokawa hooks would make removal faster and more convenient.

Accordingly, independent claim 48 is patentable over Kain and Ichinokawa. Dependent claims 49-53, 60, 61, and 63 are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Additionally, dependent claims 51, 60, and 61 recite that the base and the backrest can separate when the backrest is rotated about 180 degrees from the normal use position. The Office has not shown any corresponding teaching in Kain modified to include the Ichinokawa hooks.

New claims 66 and 67 are believed to be patentable over the art of record.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a

check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date October 25, 2005

By Mary Michelle Kile, Reg. No. 35,217

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5349
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

for Andrew E. Rawlins
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 34,702